

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Patent Application of	: PATENT APPLICATION
	:
Michael P. Dobrasko et al	: Group Art Unit: 1751
	:
Serial No: 10/780,449	: Examiner: Gregory E. Webb
	:
Filed: February 13, 2004	: Atty. Docket No.: 1914 A1
	:
For: 1,2-Dichloroethylene Compositions	: Confirmation No.: 1510

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner For Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

REPLY UNDER 37 CFR 1.111

In response to the Office Action of March 12, 2007, the following remarks are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Remarks/Responses to Rejections begin on page 2.

THE RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

The Examiner has required restriction under 35 U.S.C. 121 between the following two groups of claims:

Group I: Claims 1-23, which are said to be drawn to vapor degreasing compositions, classified in Class 510, subclass 177, and

Group II: Claims 24-29, which are said to be drawn to a process for removing greases, classified in Class 134, subclass 38.

The Examiner has argued that the inventions of the claims of Groups I and II are distinct, each from the other because they are related as product and process of use, and the product of the claims of Group I, as claimed, can be used in a materially different process, notably as a wipe solvent that would not necessarily require vaporization. The Examiner further argues that there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search, citing section 808.02 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP).

The foregoing restriction requirement is respectfully traversed for the following reasons. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

It is argued in the restriction statement that composition claims 1-23 are drawn to "vapor degreasing compositions". In fact, claims 1-20 are directed to a 1,2-dichloroethylene composition containing a specified stabilizing system. There is no limitation that the compositions of claims 1-20 be used as "vapor degreasing compositions". Only composition claims 21-23 contain field of use language; namely, a "vapor degreasing solvent composition". Therefore, the compositions of claims 1-20 include any use, including but not limited to, removing grease by wiping or by vapor degreasing.


It is further argued in the communication of March 12, 2007 that a different field of search would be required. However, since claims 1-20 are not restricted to vapor degreasing, as argued, the Examiner's search will include a search not only for the composition as claimed, but also of any use of the application – including vapor degreasing. Hence, different fields of search are not required. Moreover, it is submitted that wiping an article to remove grease is not a "**materially**" different process than vapor

degreasing. Both processes remove grease from an article – each being a specie of the generic process of removing grease.

This confirms the undersigned attorney's election with traverse of the composition claims of Group I, i.e., claims 1-23, during a telephone conversation on September 1, 2006. Claims 1-23 encompass the elected invention.

In view of the above comments, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the restriction requirement and rejoin the restricted claims.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Deborah M. Altman". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed contact information.

Deborah M. Altman
Registration No. 42,259
Attorney of Record
Telephone: 412-434-2922
Facsimile: 412-434-4292

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
April 11, 2007